

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
STATESBORO DIVISION

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
STATESBORO DIV.

APR 31 PM 12:07
CLERK R. Ann
SO. DIST. OF GA.

DAVID LAMAR NORTH,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANNIE THOMPSON, Warden,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: CV611-014

MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, an inmate presently confined at Smith State Prison in Glennville, Georgia, filed an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. An inmate proceeding in a civil action against officers or employees of government entities must comply with the mandates of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 & 1915A. In determining compliance, the court shall be guided by the longstanding principle that *pro se* pleadings are entitled to liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); Walker v. Dugger, 860 F.2d 1010, 1011 (11th Cir. 1988).

28 U.S.C. § 1915A requires a district court to screen the complaint for cognizable claims before or as soon as possible after docketing. The court must dismiss the complaint or any portion of the complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary damages from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915A(b)(1) and (2).

In Mitchell v. Farcass, 112 F. 3d 1483, 1490 (11th Cir. 1997), the Eleventh Circuit interpreted the language contained in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), which is nearly identical to that contained in the screening provisions at § 1915A(b). As the language of § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) closely tracks the language of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), the court held that the same standards for determining whether to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6) should be applied to prisoner complaints filed pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Mitchell, 112 F. 3d at 1490. The Court may dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim only where it appears beyond a doubt that a *pro se* litigant can prove no set of facts that would entitle him to relief. Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 10 (1980); Mitchell, 112 F. 3d at 1490. While the court in Mitchell interpreted § 1915(e), its interpretation guides this Court in applying the identical language of § 1915A.

Plaintiff claims there is a lot of violence at Smith State Prison. Plaintiff claims he was robbed of some store goods he bought totaling \$60.00. Plaintiff states he is mocked and called a "coward" for not fighting back after he was robbed.

Plaintiff names Warden Dannie Thompson as the Defendant in this case. A plaintiff must set forth "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief." FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2). It appears that Plaintiff attempts to hold Defendant Thompson liable based solely on his supervisory position. In § 1983 actions, liability must be based on something more than a theory of respondeat superior. Braddy v. Fla. Dep't of Labor and Employment Sec., 133 F.3d 797, 801 (11th Cir. 1998).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is my **RECOMMENDATION** that Plaintiff's complaint be **DISMISSED**.

SO REPORTED and **RECOMMENDED**, this 3/3rd day of March, 2011.



JAMES E. GRAHAM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE